



Texas Department of Insurance

Division of Workers' Compensation

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48

7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1645

512-804-4000 telephone • 512-804-4811 fax • www.tdi.texas.gov

MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

GENERAL INFORMATION

Requestor Name and Address

RENAISSANCE HOSPITAL DALLAS
C/O BURTON & HYDE PLLC
PO BOX 684749
AUSTIN TX 78768-4749

Carrier's Austin Representative Box
#01

MFDR Date Received
NOVEMBER 6, 2007

Respondent Name

TX ASSOC OF COUNTIES RMP

MFDR Tracking Number

M4-08-1701-01

REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor's Position Summary Dated November 1, 2007: "This bill should have been audited and reimbursed per the Stop-Loss reimbursement factor and methodology per the criteria as defined in TDI-DWC rule 134.401(c)(6)(A)...Per the stop-loss method the carrier should have reimbursed the provider \$58,819.91."

Requestor's Supplemental Position Summary Dated September 26, 2011: "1. The Audited charges of \$78,426.55 for [Claimant's] hospital inpatient admission exceeds the \$40,000 stop-loss threshold. 2. The services rendered to [Claimant] were unusually costly and extensive...because:

- **[Claimant] underwent multiple surgeries.** [Claimant's] hospital stay involved multiple surgical procedures which included: Anterior cervical discectomy, fusion and instrumentation at C5-C6, C6-C7; Insertion of PEEK cages at C5-C6, C6-C7; and Neuromuscular functional testing.
- **[Claimant's] admission was complicated.** [Claimant's] surgeries were complicated by the fact that she had bronchitis and a history of smoking and illegal drug use. Post-operatively she was diagnosed with a head abrasion (910.0) and she reported neck pain and pain and numbness on her tongue. Upon examination there was a bloody abrasion on her tongue.
- **The cost of the admission as outside of the ordinary.** [Claimant's] hospital admission was outside of the ordinary because the cost of the services for this admission when compared to the results of a statistical survey of system-wide data maintained by the Division for hospital inpatient admissions in Texas exceeded the norm. The average amount billed for hospital inpatient admissions system-wide in the State of Texas in 2007 was \$39,766.32. The average amount billed for hospital inpatient admissions with Principal Diagnosis Code (722.0) and Principal Procedure Code (81.02) in 2007 was \$50,226.25. The charge for [Claimant's] admission was \$78,426.55. [Claimant's] hospital admission was outside of the ordinary because the amount billed was greater than the system-wide average for 2007... For these reasons, the Medical Fee Dispute Officer should find that the second-prong of the two part test is satisfied and order additional reimbursement be paid by the carrier according to the stop-loss calculation methodology."

Amount in Dispute: \$47,554.41

RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Respondent's Position Summary Dated November 27, 2007: "The bill in dispute involves the charges for the in-patient hospitalization of the Claimant for surgery. The Provider billed the Carrier \$78,426.55 for the total cost

of the hospitalization, surgery, and implantables for the single day admission. Of the total charges, \$34,821.30 was billed for implantables. The Carrier reimbursed the Provider \$10,147.50 for implantables, based on the implantable cost multiplied by 10%. The Carrier also reimbursed the provider \$1,118.00 for the single day admission. This produced a total reimbursement of \$11,265.50 for the single day admission and implantables. The Provider seeks additional reimbursement herein for 75% of the total billed charges over and above the single day admission already reimbursed for an additional \$47,554.41. Services provided during this hospital stay were not unusually extensive or costly...Only one operation occurred, with only one use of the surgical theater and associated equipment. The single level spinal surgery consisted of one single procedure, planned from the beginning and not the result of any complications during the surgery. The surgery lasted less than two and a half hours, with no complications per the operative report, and the claimant was released home the next day. Consequently, this surgical admission does not qualify for reimbursement under the stop-loss provisions of Rule 134.401...No additional reimbursement is due under the Act and Rules...the Provider has not shown itself to be entitled to additional reimbursement."

Respondent's Supplemental Position Summary Dated September 30, 2011: "The bill in dispute involves the charges for the in-patient hospitalization of the Claimant for surgery. The Provider alleges that the in-patient hospitalization qualifies for reimbursement under Stop/Loss...In this case...only one operation occurred, with only one use of the surgical theater and associated equipment. Although the single surgery consisted of multiple separate procedures, these procedures were planned from the beginning and not the result of any complications during the surgery. The surgery lasted approximately three hours with no complications per the operative report, and the claimant was released home after one day. Consequently, this surgical admission does not qualify for reimbursement under the Stop-Loss provisions of Rule 134.401."

Responses Submitted by: Parker & Associates, LLC

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

| Disputed Dates | Disputed Services | Amount In Dispute | Amount Due |
|---|-----------------------------|-------------------|------------|
| March 7, 2007 through March 8, 2007 | Inpatient Hospital Services | \$47,554.41 | \$0.00 |

FINDINGS AND DECISION

This medical fee dispute is decided pursuant to Texas Labor Code §413.031 and all applicable, adopted rules of the Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation.

Background

1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.305 and §133.307, 31 *Texas Register* 10314, applicable to requests filed on or after January 15, 2007, sets out the procedures for resolving medical fee disputes.
2. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401, 22 *Texas Register* 6264, effective August 1, 1997, sets out the fee guidelines for inpatient services rendered in an acute care hospital.
3. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1, 31 *Texas Register* 3561, effective May 2, 2006, sets out the guidelines for a fair and reasonable amount of reimbursement in the absence of a contract or an applicable division fee guideline.

The services in dispute were reduced/denied by the respondent with the following reason codes:

Explanation of Benefits

- W1 – WORKERS COMPENSATION STATE FEE SCHEDULE ADJUSTMENT.
- 5083 – STOP-LOSS THRESHOLD IS ESTABLISHED TO ENSURE COMPENSATION FOR "UNUSUALLY EXTENSIVE" SERVICE REQUIRED DURING ADMISSION. AFTER REVIEWING THE SUBMITTED DOCUMENTATION, IT HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED THAT THERE WERE NO UNUSUALLY EXTENSIVE SERVICES PROVIDED. REIMBURSEMENT WILL BE MADE PER ACIIFG STANDARD PER DIEM AMOUNT PLUS THE ADDITIONAL ITEMS LISTED UNDER ADDITIONAL REIMBURSEMENT, PLEASE REFERENCE DWC RULE 134.401(C)(6).
- 42 – CHARGES EXCEED OUR FEE SCHEDULE OR MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE AMOUNT.
- 309 – THE CHARGE FOR THIS PROCEDURE EXCEEDS THE FEE SCHEDULE ALLOWANCE.
- W4 – NO ADDITIONAL REIMBURSEMENT ALLOWED AFTER REVIEW OF APPEAL/RECONSIDERATION.
- 1014 – THE ATTACHED BILLING HAS BEEN RE-EVALUATED AT THE REQUEST OF THE PROVIDER.

BASED ON THIS RE-EVALUATION, WE FIND OUR ORIGINAL REVIEW TO BE CORRECT. THEREFORE, NO ADDITIONAL ALLOWANCE APPEARS TO BE WARRANTED.

- 16 – CLAIM/SERVICE LACKS INFORMATION WHICH IS NEEDED FOR ADJUDICATION. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IS SUPPLIED USING REMITTANCE ADVICE REMARKS CODES WHENEVER APPROPRIATE
- B13 – PREVIOUSLY PAID. PAYMENT FOR THIS CLAIM/SERVICE MAY HAVE BEEN PROVIDED IN A PREVIOUS PAYMENT.
- 247 – A PAYMENT OR DENIAL HAS ALREADY BEEN RECOMMENDED FOR THIS SERVICE.
- 18 – DUPLICATE CLAIM/SERVICE
- * – Provide actual Supply House Invoice for the implants as a Purchase Order is not an acceptable substitution reflecting the actual cost of supplies.

U.S. Bankruptcy Judge Michael Lynn issued a “STIPULATION AND ORDER GRANTING RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY TO PERMIT CONTINUANCE AND ADJUDICATION OF DISPUTED WORKERS COMPENSATION CLAIMS BEFORE THE TEXAS STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS,” dated August 27, 2010, in the case of *In re: Renaissance Hospital – Grand Prairie, Inc. d/b/a/ Renaissance Hospital – Grand Prairie, et al.*, in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Texas, Fort Worth Division in Case No. 08-43775-7. The order lifted the automatic stay to allow continuance of the claim adjudication process as to the workers’ compensation receivables before SOAH, effective October 1, 2010. The order specified John Dee Spicer as the Chapter 7 trustee of the debtor’s estate. By letter dated October 5, 2010, Mr. Spicer provided express written authorization for Cass Burton of the law office of Burton & Hyde, PLLC, PO Box 684749, Austin, Texas 78768-4749, to be the point of contact on Mr. Spicer’s behalf relating to matters between and among the debtors and the Division concerning medical fee disputes. The Division will utilize this address in all communications with the requestor regarding this medical fee dispute.

Issues

1. Did the audited charges exceed \$40,000.00?
2. Did the admission in dispute involve unusually extensive services?
3. Did the admission in dispute involve unusually costly services?
4. Is the requestor entitled to additional reimbursement?

Findings

This dispute relates to inpatient surgical services provided in a hospital setting with reimbursement subject to the provisions of Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401, titled *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline*, effective August 1, 1997, 22 Texas Register 6264. The Third Court of Appeals’ November 13, 2008 opinion in *Texas Mutual Insurance Company v. Vista Community Medical Center, LLP*, 275 South Western Reporter Third 538, 550 (Texas Appeals – Austin 2008, petition denied) addressed a challenge to the interpretation of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401. The Court concluded that “to be eligible for reimbursement under the Stop-Loss Exception, a hospital must demonstrate that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000 and that an admission involved unusually costly and unusually extensive services.” Both the requestor and respondent in this case were notified via form letter that the mandate for the decision cited above was issued on January 19, 2011. Each was given the opportunity to supplement their original MDR submission, position or response as applicable. The division received supplemental information as noted in the position summaries above. The supplemental information was shared among the parties as appropriate. The documentation filed by the requestor and respondent to date will be considered in determining whether the admission in dispute is eligible for reimbursement under the stop-loss method of payment. Consistent with the Third Court of Appeals’ November 13, 2008 opinion, the division will address whether the total audited charges **in this case** exceed \$40,000; whether the admission and disputed services **in this case** are unusually extensive; and whether the admission and disputed services **in this case** are unusually costly. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(2)(C) states, in pertinent part, that “Independent reimbursement is allowed on a case-by-case basis if the particular case exceeds the stop-loss threshold as described in paragraph (6) of this subsection...” 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6) puts forth the requirements to meet the three factors that will be discussed.

1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6)(A)(i) states “...to be eligible for stop-loss payment the total audited charges for a hospital admission must exceed \$40,000, the minimum stop-loss threshold.” Furthermore, (A) (v) of that same section states “...Audited charges are those charges which remain after a bill review by the insurance carrier has been performed...” Review of the explanation of benefits issued by the carrier finds that the carrier did not deduct any charges in accordance with §134.401(c)(6)(A)(v); therefore the audited charges equal \$78,426.55. The Division concludes that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000.

In its original position statement, the requestor asserts that “This bill should have been audited and reimbursed per the Stop-Loss reimbursement factor and methodology per the criteria as defined in TDI-DWC rule 134.401(c)(6)(A).” 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(2)(C) allows for payment under the stop-loss exception on a case-by-case basis only if the particular case exceeds the stop-loss threshold as described in paragraph (6). Paragraph (6)(A)(ii) states that “This stop-loss threshold is established to ensure compensation for unusually extensive services required during an admission.” The Third Court of Appeals’ November 13, 2008 opinion states that “to be eligible for reimbursement under the Stop-Loss Exception, a hospital must demonstrate that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000 and that an admission involved unusually costly and unusually extensive services.” The requestor’s original position statement failed to discuss the particulars of the admission in dispute that may constitute unusually extensive services. In its supplemental position statement, the requestor considered the Courts’ final judgment. In regards to whether the services were unusually extensive, the Third Court of Appeals’ November 13, 2008 opinion concluded that in order to be eligible for reimbursement under the stop-loss exception, a hospital must demonstrate that an admission involved unusually extensive services. The requestor’s supplemental position statement asserts, that “The services rendered to [Claimant] were unusually costly and extensive...because: [Claimant] underwent multiple surgeries. [Claimant’s] admission was complicated.” The requestor’s position that this admission is unusually extensive due to surgical procedures and a complicated admission fails to meet the requirements of §134.401(c)(2)(C) because the requestor failed to demonstrate how the services in dispute were unusually extensive in relation to similar spinal surgeries or admissions. The division concludes that the requestor failed to meet the requirements of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(2)(C).

2. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6) states that “Stop-loss is an independent reimbursement methodology established to ensure fair and reasonable compensation to the hospital for unusually costly services rendered during treatment to an injured worker.” The requestor in its supplemental position summary states:

The cost of the admission as outside of the ordinary. [Claimant’s] hospital admission was outside of the ordinary because the cost of the services for this admission when compared to the results of a statistical survey of system-wide data maintained by the Division for hospital inpatient admissions in Texas exceeded the norm. The average amount billed for hospital inpatient admissions system-wide in the State of Texas in 2007 was \$39,766.32. The average amount billed for hospital inpatient admissions with Principal Diagnosis Code (722.0) and Principal Procedure Code (81.02) in 2007 was \$50,226.25. The charge for [Claimant’s] admission was \$78,426.55. [Claimant’s] hospital admission was outside of the ordinary because the amount billed was greater than the system-wide average for 2007... For these reasons, the Medical Fee Dispute Officer should find that the second-prong of the two part test is satisfied and order additional reimbursement be paid by the carrier according to the stop-loss calculation methodology.

The division notes that the audited charges of \$78,426.55 are discussed above as a separate and distinct factor pursuant to 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6)(A)(i). The requestor asserts that because the amount **billed charges** exceeds the average for the same principal diagnosis and procedure codes, the **cost** of the services is therefore “out of the ordinary.” Although the requestor lists and quantifies **billing** data, the requestor fails to list or quantify the **costs** associated with the disputed services. In the adoption preamble to the Division’s former *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline*, 22 Texas Register 6276, the division concluded that “hospital charges are not a valid indicator of a hospital’s costs of providing services.” The division concludes that the billed charges for the services do not represent the cost of providing those services. The requestor fails to demonstrate that the hospital’s resources used in this particular admission are unusually costly.

3. For the reasons stated above the services in dispute are not eligible for the stop-loss method of reimbursement. Consequently, reimbursement shall be calculated pursuant to 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(1) titled *Standard Per Diem Amount* and §134.401(c)(4) titled *Additional Reimbursements*. The Division notes that additional reimbursements under §134.401(c)(4) apply only to bills that do not reach the stop-loss threshold described in subsection (c)(6) of this section.
 - Review of the submitted documentation finds that the services provided were surgical; therefore the standard per diem amount of \$1,118.00 per day applies. Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(3)(ii) states, in pertinent part, that “The applicable Workers’ Compensation Standard Per Diem Amount (SPDA) is multiplied by the length of stay (LOS) for admission...” The length of stay was one day. The surgical per diem rate of \$1,118.00 multiplied by the length of stay of one day results in an allowable amount of \$1,118.00.
 - 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(4)(A), states “When medically necessary the following services indicated by revenue codes shall be reimbursed at cost to the hospital plus 10%: (i) Implantables (revenue codes 275, 276, and 278), and (ii) Orthotics and prosthetics (revenue code 274).”
 - A review of the submitted medical bill indicates that the requestor billed revenue code 278 for Implants at \$34,821.30.

- The Division finds the total allowable for the implants billed under revenue code 278 is:

| Description of Implant per Itemized Statement | Quantity | Cost Invoice | Cost + 10% |
|---|----------|-----------------------------|------------|
| 4.0 14mm Fixed Cervical Screw | 6 | \$300.00/each | \$1,980.00 |
| 7 and 8 mm C PEEK – Omni | 2 | \$2,100.00/each | \$4,620.00 |
| 1cc Putty – Osteotech | 1 | \$185.00 | \$203.50 |
| Cervical Plate 39mm – Omni | 1 | \$2,700.00 | \$2,970.00 |
| Staple PSW-35 | 1 | No support for cost/invoice | \$0.00 |
| TOTAL | 11 | | \$9,773.50 |

- 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(4)(C) states “Pharmaceuticals administered during the admission and greater than \$250 charged per dose shall be reimbursed at cost to the hospital plus 10%. Dose is the amount of a drug or other substance to be administered at one time.” A review of the submitted itemized statement finds that the requestor billed \$252.00/unit for Thrombinar 5000 units, \$289.00/unit for Robinal 0.2mg/ml 5ml. The requestor did not submit documentation to support what the cost to the hospital was for these items billed under revenue code 250. For that reason, additional reimbursement for these items cannot be recommended.

The division concludes that the total allowable for this admission is \$10,891.50. The respondent paid \$11,265.50. Based upon the documentation submitted, no additional reimbursement can be recommended.

Conclusion

The submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amount sought by the requestor. The requestor in this case demonstrated that the audited charges exceed \$40,000, but failed to demonstrate that the disputed inpatient hospital admission involved unusually extensive services, and failed to demonstrate that the services in dispute were unusually costly. Consequently, 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(1) titled *Standard Per Diem Amount*, and §134.401(c)(4) titled *Additional Reimbursements* are applied and result in no additional reimbursement.

ORDER

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code §413.031, the Division has determined that the requestor is entitled to \$0.00 additional reimbursement for the services in dispute.

Authorized Signature

Signature

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer

3/22/2013

Date

YOUR RIGHT TO APPEAL

Either party to this medical fee dispute may appeal this decision by requesting a contested case hearing. A completed **Request for a Medical Contested Case Hearing** (form **DWC045A**) must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **twenty** days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. The party seeking review of the MDR decision shall deliver a copy of the request for a hearing to all other parties involved in the dispute at the same time the request is filed with the Division. **Please include a copy of the *Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision* together with any other required information specified in 28 Texas Administrative Code §148.3(c), including a **certificate of service demonstrating that the request has been sent to the other party.****

Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.